DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 179 326 RC 011 664

AUTHOR	Chu, Lily
TITLE	Toward A Humanistic Behaviorism: Self-Efficacy in Multicultural Education. A Presentation in the College of Education Dialogue Series, New Mexico State University.
INSTITUTION	New Mexico State Univ., Las Cruces.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	23 Oct 79
GRANT	NIE-G-79-0012
NOTE	49p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Attitudes; *Behavior; Behavior Theories; Cultural Disadvantagement; *Equal Education; Ethnicity; Expectation; *Humanism; Locus of Control; Minority Groups; Motivation; *Multicultural Education; Self Control; *Self Determination; *Student Responsibility; Teacher Influence; Teacher Responsibility
IDENTIFIERS	*Self Efficacy

ABSTRACT

The paper approaches the issue of educational equity from the perspective of individuals' perceptions of the opportunity available to them and their ability to interact with their world effectively. The proposed model of humanistic behaviorism, with its emphasis on self-efficacy, has special implications for multicultural education. The changing social, environmental conditions with intention to provide more opportunity for those who are traditionally disadvantaged may not result in corresponding equal participation, if the subjective expectancy concerning the personal accessibility to this opportunity is not fostered at the same time. The teacher's role in multicultural settings is a key factor toward the development of students' attitudes about themselves in schools. Goodwill toward students alone may not be sufficient to bring about humane and efficacious interactions, but must be accompanied by responsible, thoughtful strategies, by allowing the student the chance to make the quest for personal control. There exists a reciprocal interactive relationship between teachers' sense of self-efficacy in teaching and motivating the students, students' sense of self-efficacy in their ability to learn, and the general multicultural environmental variable. The development of self-efficacy is contingent upon one's taking personal responsibility for one's teaching or learning. (Author/NEC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED179326

TOWARD A HUMANISTIC BEHAVIORISM:

SELF-EFFICACY IN MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

A Presentation in the College of Education

DIALOGUE SERIES

New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico

by

Lily Chu, Ph.D.
College of Education
New Mexico State University

October 23, 1979

RC 011664

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lily Chu

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FOOTNOTE

This monograph was supported by the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Grant No. NIE-G-79-0012, Project No. 8-1096). However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	2
	The Dichotomy Between Behaviorism and Humanism	2
	Social Behaviorism	4
	Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory	7
III.	LITERATURE REVIEW	10
	Teacher Expectancies--Sociology of Schools Perspectives	10
	Teacher Effectiveness--Teacher Education Perspectives	15
	Self-Efficacy--Social Psychology Perspectives	18
	Effectance as a motivation	18
	Locus of control	20
	Racial and socio-economic differences in locus of control	23
	Locus of control revised	25
	A cognitive psychology of motivation	26
IV.	IMPLICATIONS	28
	Toward a Humanistic Behaviorism	28
	Self-Efficacy in Multicultural Education	35
	REFERENCES	39

TOWARD A HUMANISTIC BEHAVIORISM:

SELF-EFFICACY IN MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

I. INTRODUCTION

The issue of educational equity relates to many complicated socio-psychological variables, and therefore may be approached best through working simultaneously with as many channels as possible. Most of the current approaches used in preparing educators to provide equal education for all students can be classified into two major categories: The first centers on changing the social, environmental conditions to make them more favorable for those who are traditionally disadvantaged; the other is concerned with the development of successful coping behaviors or survival skills to make social, economic upward mobility possible for those disadvantaged by means of improving their reading and writing skills, as well as higher educational attainment. The present study is mainly concerned with the third channel from the perspective of individuals' perceptions of the opportunity available to them and their ability to interact with their world effectively. A model based on a humanistic behaviorism is proposed to enhance self-efficacy in multicultural education.

Dr. Albert Bandura, a noted psychologist, recently proposed a theory of self-efficacy (1977) and a model of reciprocal interaction as a unified theory for behavioral change (1978). According to this reciprocal interactive model, psychological functioning involves a continuous reciprocal interaction between the person's behavior, cognitive structure, and the environment in a triadic-interdependent way. According to the theory of self-efficacy, the concept of self-efficacy occupies a central role in

creating behavioral changes. Traditionally, the behavioral approach to psychology maintains that human behavior is the direct result of environmental influences; it often bypasses the internal structure of the individual which results in the dichotomy of behaviorism and humanism. However, it has been amply documented lately through the studies of cognitive and social psychology that the cognitive process plays a prominent role in the behavior of the individual, thus interestingly, bringing humanistic and behavioristic approaches in close alignment. "It is true that behavior is influenced by the environment, but the environment is partly of a person's own making. By their actions, people play a role in creating the social milieu and other circumstances that arise in their daily transactions. Thus, from the social learning perspective, psychological functioning involves a continuous reciprocal interaction between behavioral, cognitive, and environmental influences" (Bandura, 1978, p. 345). The present study adopts the above mentioned social learning perspective as its theoretical background which will be discussed further in the following section. The next section of the paper will provide a literature review on the significance of self-efficacy in teacher-student interaction, with special emphasis on multicultural education. The final section of the paper will propose a humanistic behaviorism and address the implications the self-efficacy model may have in multicultural education.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The Dichotomy Between Behaviorism and Humanism

Education has depended upon psychology as a source to provide

information concerning human behavior, how we learn, grow and develop. However, psychology itself has had many different theories of learning, and among psychologists themselves, there have been fundamentally opposing approaches to understand human behavior which has left educators baffled and divided. In the radical behaviorism, with B. F. Skinner and J. B. Watson as its most well-known spokesmen, motivational and dispositional constructs are annunciated. Instead of trying to infer motives and conflicts, radical behaviorists devote themselves to the experimental analysis of the observable conditions that control behavior. Behavior is looked upon as the result of previous conditioning with unconditional stimuli, or the result of a past reinforcement schedule. There is no inner construct which cannot be directly and readily studied through observable behavior. Freedom is only an illusion since all of us are controlled by antecedents and consequences of our behaviors which are beyond ourselves. Radical behaviorism has been very productive and has stimulated a great deal of systematic research on the effects of reinforcement, the patterning of reinforcement, and the phenomena of generalization and discrimination in learning. However, to many, psychology as dominated by this mechanistic behaviorism "first lost its soul, and then its mind."

On the other hand, the humanistic psychologists represented by such prominent people as Carl Rogers, Abraham Maslow, and Alfred Adler, among many others, insist upon the importance of the "self," the person's subjective, internal experiences, his/her self-concept, and his/her subjective interpretation of the surrounding events. Over the years, humanism has made significant impacts in the areas of education (humanistic education), counseling (client-centered therapy), and personality theory

(the phenomenological approach, the self-psychology). Humanism's emphasis on the person's cognitions and personal interpretations of experiences appeals to many people who believe that Skinnerism bypasses a significant part of human beings. Humanism stresses that the way the individual sees himself/herself and the world is one of the most influential forces in one's life, and that "man is what he/she makes of himself/herself." However, what are the causes/variables that govern the making of the person and the way he/she conceives himself/herself to be in particular ways? There have been limited experimental studies and evidences to support humanism's rather general statements. The most fundamental criticism of humanistic psychology is that it is incomplete conceptually and that it does not provide a sufficiently detailed and comprehensive analysis of the causes which control behavior. Personal constructs such as mental states, perceptions, cognitions, feelings or motives are often used as explanations of behavior whereas the causal variables of those neutral states themselves are usually ignored, leading to Skinner's criticism of "mental way stations" for circular and unfinished causal/consequences explanations. The humanistic approach, at its most, is descriptive rather than explanatory of human nature (Smith, 1950).

Social Behaviorism

In the middle of those two opposite camps, seemingly impossible to reconcile in their fundamentally incompatible approaches to human nature, there emerges social behaviorism. Social behaviorism utilizes the same experimental methodologies as employed by radical behaviorism, and builds upon behaviorism's research findings on the effects of reinforcement. However, social behaviorism is concerned basically with human social and

interpersonal behavior, and as such, the mediating variables such as cognitive processes, expectancies and values, the awareness of learning, rule and symbolic processes and the vicarious learning have gradually become the center of social learning theory. Thus, social behaviorism may provide the linking bridge between radical behaviorism and humanism.

In recent years, social behaviorism has generated a number of significant research studies especially in the areas of how humans perceive the causes of behavior, and the central role the subjective expectancy of outcomes plays in our emotion, cognition, and motivation. In the former area of perceiving the causes of behavior, a number of researchers such as Jones, Kanouse, Kelley, and Nisbett (1971), Ross, Rodin, Valins, and Zimbardo (1969) have demonstrated how the attribution of the causes is affected by the order of events, actor/observer dichotomy, success or failure outcome, language label used, among other situational variables. Weiner and Kukla (1971, 1974) formulated an attribution model of motivation, and demonstrated that different achievement behavior is related to different attribution of success and failure outcomes. Schachter's (1962, 1971) emotional attribution theory states that a person's emotional state is based on both the person's state of physiological arousal, and the person's socially dependent perception of the reasons for this arousal. Schachter's theory of emotional attribution and Weiner's theory of motivational attribution have further reinforced the assertion of social learning theory in terms of the role cognition plays in human social behavior. Some of Weiner's studies will be further examined in the literature review section.

In the latter area of how the subjective expectancy of outcome affects human behavior, J. B. Rotter's expectancy theory in general and his concept of locus of control in particular (1954, 1966, 1972) have become very influential in the area of social psychology. Rotter's expectancy theory introduces a strong cognitive element to personality-oriented theories. His emphasis on the individual's subjective expectations about future outcomes and the subjective value of reinforcements in the person's psychological situation is reminiscent of the position of humanistic psychologists. Contrary to humanistic psychologists, Rotter is interested in the conditions that lead to such subjective expectations. The person's subjective expectancies regarding probable outcomes reflect his/her past learning experiences in similar situations; expectations are a function of the person's direct past reinforcement. Similarly, the subjective values of outcomes are a function of prior learning. Specific expectancies are easily modified by minor alterations in the individual's situation. General expectancies are presumably more consistent and remain relatively stable across situations; although similar to traits, general expectancies are learned expectations in Rotter's formulation.

Locus of control attribution is conceived by Rotter as an alternative to the generalized expectancy. Locus of control deals with a person's subjective attribution of the relationship between one's behavior and its consequences to either each one's own effort or to outside uncontrollable events (Rotter, 1966). Internal orientation refers to the tendency to perceive events, whether positive or negative, as being a consequence of one's own actions and therefore potentially under the person's control.

The generalized external control, on the other hand, refers to the perception of events as being independent of one's own behavior, and therefore beyond personal control. Locus of control is a learned expectancy, and has many significant consequences in affecting our behavior. Some relevant studies on locus of control will be discussed under the literature review section.

Bandura's Self-Efficacy Theory

Albert Bandura (1969, 1971, 1977, 1978) is a well-known contemporary spokesman for social behaviorism just as Skinner is for radical behaviorism. Bandura proposes observational learning in addition to classical and operant conditioning, by asserting that learning can result without any direct rewards or reinforcement. His observational learning is also called cognitive learning, symbolic learning, vicarious learning or modeling. All these terms refer to learning without direct external reinforcement or without even making observable responses. Bandura also expands behavior modification techniques originated by radical behaviorism to change human behavior in various human, social and institutional settings (Bandura, et al., 1969).

Recently, Bandura (1977, 1978) proposes a reciprocal-interactive model as a conceptual framework to understand the relationship between the person's behavior, personal variables and environmental variables. Over the years, social psychologists have generally agreed that behavior results from the interaction of persons and situations (Bowers, 1973; Endler & Magnusson, 1975) which leads to the formulation of a unidimensional orientation toward behavior.

$$B = f(P,E)$$

However, Bandura contends that personal and environmental variables do not function independently. "It is largely through their actions that people produce the environmental conditions that affect their behavior in a reciprocal fashion. The experiences generated by behavior also partly determine what individuals think, expect and can do, which in turn, affect their subsequent behavior" (1978, p. 345). A modification of the first model might be as follows:

$$B = f \quad (P \longleftrightarrow E)$$

This second model is still inappropriate according to Bandura. Even though persons and situations are considered to be interdependent in this second model, but "behavior is treated as though it were only a by-product that does not figure at all in the causal process" (1978, p. 345).

The model Bandura proposes is reciprocal-interactive and deterministic:

In this model, behavior, internal personal factors and environmental influences operate and affect each other as interlocking determinants. In this triadic reciprocal interaction, the changes of any one apex will affect others. "For example, people's efficacy and outcome expectations influence how they behave, and the environmental effects created by their actions in turn alter their expectations" (1978, p. 346).

In Bandura's self-efficacy theory (1977), as a unified theory of behavioral changes, Bandura maintains that behavioral changes may be created effectively by many different approaches, such as by altering the cognitive processes, by fostering the development of performance-based

effective behaviors, or by rearrangement of environmental events. Because of the reciprocal/interdependent nature of behavior, personal variables and environmental variables, all of the above mentioned procedures are effective means to change behavior as a result of the changed sense of self-efficacy. The assumption basic to this theoretical framework is that the concept of self-efficacy occupies a central role in behavioral changes and that psychological procedures designed to change behavior, "whatever their form, serve as means of creating and strengthening expectations of personal efficacy" (1977, p. 193).

Self-efficacy is defined by Bandura as an expectation that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcomes. As compared to Rotter's expectancy theory which deals with the person's subjective expectations about outcomes, Bandura's self-efficacy theory deals with the expectations concerning behavior that is required to produce the outcomes. "Outcome and efficacy expectations are differentiated because individuals can believe that a particular course of action will produce certain outcomes, but if they entertain serious doubts about whether they can perform the necessary activities, such information does not affect their behavior" (1977, p. 193).

Bandura's self-efficacy theory thus has a central cognitive component which in turn ties in strongly with the person's behavior, and is situationally specific in defining what is an effective transaction with the environment. Recent studies on behavioral changes tend to support Bandura's self-efficacy theory. As Bandura stated, "generalized, lasting changes in self-efficacy and behavior can best be achieved by participant methods using powerful induction procedures initially to develop capabilities,

then removing external aids to verify personal efficacy, then finally using self-directed mastery to strengthen and generalize expectations of personal efficacy" (1978, p. 102).

Bandura's theory of self-efficacy, and his model of reciprocal interactive determinism have tremendous implications for education and psychology in terms of changing human behavior and improving human conditions. At this moment, a forthcoming issue of Advances in Behaviour Research and Therapy is devoted to a critical examination of this self-efficacy concept. It is expected that the self-efficacy theory and the reciprocal model of interactive determinism will stimulate much research in human social behavior in the years to come.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

Teacher Expectancies--Sociology of Schools Perspectives*

In International Foundations of Education Quarterly, Bergsma (1974) reviewed research relating teacher behavior and teacher attitudes to student school achievement and found that the picture was complex and confusing. David A. Potter (1974) states this well when he says that the quest for understanding the meaning of student-teacher relationships might validly be compared to the apocryphal blind men attempting to describe an elephant. Each study examines only a highly limited segment of an extremely complex interactive process; it is hardly surprising that research has failed to capture the essence of the teaching art.

---

*The author is indebted to Dr. Harold M. Bergsma for his assistance in the sections on sociology of schools and teacher education perspectives.

One aspect of this "essence" that research has been trying to capture is the expectation a teacher holds for the students he/she instructs. Rosenthal's (1968) studies set the stage for a host of studies dealing with teacher expectancy and performance. In 1974, Marlaine Lockhead-Katz concluded that reviews of teacher expectancy literature shed very little consistent light on the answer to this question. The quest continues and it may be that the Rosenthal and Jacobsen (1968) experimenter bias studies, and subsequent attempts to replicate those findings, will eventually provoke new thoughts about the role of teacher in classroom settings as related to their expectations or cultural bias. (See Lehman, I. J., & Mehrens, W., 1971, who report five replication attempts of the experimenter bias.) In the literature survey presented by Lockhead-Katz (1974), four categories of research were reviewed. Her third and fourth categories, i.e., inferring teachers' expectancies and measuring the expectancies of teachers respectively, relate most closely to teacher experience in cross-cultural settings and will be further discussed in the present paper.

Teacher's expectations of students' capabilities according to students' social, racial, and ability groups apparently have some effects on students' reactions to their teachers and to their own capabilities and performance. Baratz and Baratz (1970) have discussed the "Early Childhood Intervention, Social Science Base of Institutional Racism," and many of their arguments relating to the unfortunate creation of biased social situations in the classroom and concomitant detrimental effects, bear serious scrutiny. Ray Rist's study (1970) infers that the social and racial characteristics of students may create a set of expectations

in the teacher which structures the teacher's classroom behavior. Such expectations may exist in the form of unconscious attitudes and may manifest itself in the type of interpersonal interactions the teacher maintains in order to insure that such expectations will become a reality in students.

Ethnic minorities' experiences in the schools include interactions with teachers which may affect self-concept and performance. George A. Miller, in an introduction to The Cultural Context of Learning and Thinking, an Exploration in Experimental Anthropology, by Michael Cole, et al. (1971), states this proposition well. "One of our most persistent (myths) is that non-literate people in less developed countries possess something we like to call a 'primitive mentality,' that is both different and inferior to our own. This myth has it that the 'primitive mind' is highly concrete, whereas the 'Western mind' is highly abstract; the 'primitive mind' connects its concrete ideas by role association whereas the 'Western mind' connects its abstract ideas by general relations. . . . The dangers inherent in this hodge-podge of half-truths do not derive solely from the blunders they inspire in our relations with the Third World. The same stereotype is likely to be applied to ethnic minorities living in the West" (p. vii).

One could anticipate the learning environments could be affected by a teacher holding such views about children who are culturally different. Rist's (1970) study provides a valuable insight, though it is admittedly inferential, that is, that a given teacher's attitude can create classroom structures which in fact predetermine, to some extent, the success or lack of success of a group of children over an extended

period of time. Clifford and Walters, as reported by Lockhead-Katz (1974), examined the effect of physical attractiveness on teachers' estimation of the child's I.Q., social relations, skills, parents' attitudes toward school, and level of expected academic school completion. The attractive students were rated high in all four categories. There was a strong predisposition among these teachers studied to evaluate attractive children more highly than unattractive children.

Hentoff (1967) and Robert Coles (1970) report situations in which teachers had little or no positive high regard for students who in turn reacted in frustration and failure. The Coles' (1970) study presents graphic personal eyewitness accounts of childrens' failures and frustration which create realistic questions about the meaning of the social learning climate of children of poverty with teachers from middle class orientations who hold expectations of children which are negative.

One finding of the Coleman Report (1966) relates specifically to the relationship of teachers to student achievement, that is, that among many variables affecting achievement is the role and attitude of the teacher. Martin Deutsch (1965) states that strong evidence can be adduced to support the assumption that it is the verbal engagement of people who surround [illegible] which is the operating influence in the child's language development. A good part of this verbal engagement, or lack of it, is with the teacher in school.

Others have been concerned with the child or learner, and the need to restructure the learning experiences for students so as to facilitate relations between races and generations. (See Robert Corkhuff and George Bank's (1970) work: "Learning as a Preferred Mode of Facilitating

Relations Between the Races and Generations.") This concern should include the need to re-emphasize international education programs, cross-cultural involvements, and research to develop models to create such awareness. (See Paul Goldin's (1970) work, "A Model for Racial Awareness Training of Teachers in Integrated Schools.") Social science teachers graduate from colleges and have often had no significant cross-cultural experience, have been isolated within the mainstream ethic and, unfortunately, often teach bias against racial or minority groups in well intended teaching sessions. Too often the teacher communicates much more than the lesson, and creates a "self-fulfilling prophecy" among minority students.

School success or failure for many children may be related to the quality of their interactions with their teachers. Race, social class and personal ability all are part of the complex picture as Rohwer (1971) reports. Children's concept of self is mirrored in the personal social interactions of the classroom. Knowledge of these interactions and expectancies is important for the development of children, according to Banks and Grambs (1972).

Recently, Hosford (1978) has begun to explore the subtle effects teachers create on their students, which he refers to as the "silent curriculum." David Aspy and Flora Roebuckin's (1977) work deals with the concept described by Hosford. It deals with how interpersonal relationships between teachers and students can be improved by teaching teachers how to change. One of the major findings of this work is that if this training relates to specific behaviors of teachers, there is greater probability that these will be used in classrooms with students.

In summary, teachers' expectations of students' capabilities apparently have some effects on students' reactions to their teachers and to their own capabilities and performance. To a degree, a given teacher's attitude can create classroom structures which predetermine the success or failure of a group of students over an extended period of time. In multicultural education settings, cultural biases or insensitivity may create a "self-fulfilling prophecy" among those students who are culturally different. Teachers communicate much more than just the lessons. The expectations teachers have toward students, and toward their own ability to teach and to motivate students are important variables, particularly in multicultural education where existing cultural stereotypes frequently shape teachers' expectations toward the culturally different students.

Teacher Effectiveness--Teacher Education Perspectives

A number of studies have been published which describe characteristics of effective teachers. As early as 1962, Sister M. Innocentia Burkard's study revealed that superior teachers, as perceived by students, had certain traits, such as their attitudes toward success, which was based on ideas that such success would involve effort and sacrifice. Conversely, the "poor teachers" perceived success to come about mostly as a matter of chance. Superior teachers thought that failure could be overcome by their personal effort, but poorer teachers attributed failure primarily to some external factors. Perhaps one of the most significant aspects of this study was the finding regarding teachers' views of others. The superior teachers viewed people positively, the poorer teachers saw people as being unhelpful, somewhat frustrating and often unforgiving.

David Ryans' (1960) extensive research on teacher characteristics is important. Using 6,000 teachers in 1,700 high schools, he obtained data about their personal attitudes. In this study the teachers who were rated as "good" were found to report that they had greater self-confidence, were more cheerful, and enjoyed personal interactions with their students. Poor teachers, however, were more critical of others and valued exactness and orderliness.

A review of studies investigating students' achievement and teacher behavior was performed by Rosenshine (1971). Rosenshine explored the relationship between students' achievement and teachers' use of approval, criticism and control. The students' achievement showed little relationship with teachers' use of approval; however, it had significant negative correlations with teachers' use of criticism and control. Rosenshine concluded that teachers who were effective personally, selected certain behaviors to utilize and avoided other behaviors in order to achieve learning and achievement among their pupils. In other words, effective teachers possess overall patterns of behavior including questioning strategies, selection of classroom structure, drill, and sought for ways to have their students elaborate their answers and discoveries, rather than merely criticizing students' mistakes and controlling their misbehavior.

Recently, several significant studies point to the possibility that a teacher's sense of efficacy is one of the most important attributes of the teacher's effectiveness. Berman (1978) states, "The teacher's sense of efficacy--a belief that the teacher can help even the most difficult or unmotivated students--showed strong positive effects on all

outcomes. Teachers' attitudes about their own professional competence, in short, may be a major determinant of what happens to projects in classrooms. In contrast, teachers' verbal ability had no relationship to project implementation, outcome or continuation with the exception of its positive correlation with improved student achievement" (p. 32). The results of this significant research raise important questions about how to design change, how to make change agents out of experienced teachers. Berman (1978) asks the question directly, "Is it possible to enhance teachers' sense of efficacy?" (p. 32).

David Armor, et al. (1976), in their report, "Analysis of the School Preferred Reading Program in Selected Los Angeles Minority Schools," analyzed groups of teachers' attributes and background characteristics and their predispositions and found no evidence of a relationship between any of these characteristics and students' reading achievement. This study also measured the sense of efficacy as perceived by the teacher in dealing with minority children. Responses to three questions were combined into a single measure of efficacy--the extent to which the teacher believes he or she has the capacity to produce an effect on the learning of students; the more efficacious the teachers felt, the more their students advanced in reading achievement (Armor, 1976).

Hosford's (1978) recent studies attempt to clarify how teacher effectiveness is perceived by students. "The real and important differences between two such pairs of teachers are the results of their instructional interpersonal relations styles" (p. 213). The "silent curriculum," as he terms it, takes four words to describe: "Procedures always affect outcomes" (p. 213). The implications of teachers' inter-

personal relations styles raised by Hosford's study are similar to those raised by others. Aspy and Roebuck (1977) report that there are positive and significant relationships between teachers' levels of interpersonal functioning, and students' (a) attendance, (b) gains on achievement test scores, and (c) enhanced self-confidence. Importantly, a fourth relationship exists between a principal's level of interpersonal functioning and the tendency on the part of teachers to employ similar interpersonal behaviors in their classrooms, which interestingly, support the retroactive interactive model proposed by Bandura (1978).

In summary, the teacher's sense of efficacy is but one aspect of the teacher's personality style; however, this sense may have a major influence on teacher effectiveness. Indeed, studies seem to point to the direction that one of the most significant variables relating to teacher effectiveness may be teachers' attitudes about their professional competence, i.e., the extent to which teachers believe that they have the capacity to produce an effect on their students' learning. Questions which arise out of this review of literature center around whether it is possible to provide training and demonstrate experimentally that such "efficacy training" does indeed create changes in teachers' sense of efficacy which in turn will trigger improved student achievement and students' attitudes.

Self-Efficacy--Social Psychology Perspectives

Effectance as a motivation. White, in 1959, proposed a monumental conceptualization of motivation which provided an alternative to the then dominant concepts of motivation held by Hull-Spence on one hand, Freud on the other. Contrary to the passive theories of drive-reduction by Hull-Spence, and of psychoanalytic instinct by Freud, White proposed that

it was necessary to treat "competence" as having a motivational aspect and that the motivation needed to attain competence cannot be wholly derived from sources of energy conceptualized as drives or instincts. He defined "competence" as an organism's capacity to interact effectively with one's environment, and the motivational aspect of competence as "effectance." This effectance motivation aims primarily for the feeling of efficacy, and not necessarily for the resulting consequences. Through documentations of developmental studies in both human beings and primates, White (1959, 1960) was able to demonstrate that in the infancy, a child becomes able to establish effective transactions with his environment and move toward a degree of autonomy. It is extremely important to note at this point that the concepts of competence, efficacy and autonomy raised by White correspond directly with the later work on "locus of control," "learned helplessness," and "self efficacy" developed from social psychology perspectives. On the other hand, White's conceptualization of motivation (1963) builds a bridge between the behavioristic psychology and the concept of ego strength proposed by Freud and further developed by the humanistic school represented by Carl Rogers, Abraham Maslow, Gordon Allport, among many others. Those humanistic psychologists' belief in human being's innate drive toward self-actualization, and that human beings are rational, purposeful and active in dealing with their environment is similar to White's concept of motivation--interestingly from a behavioristic standpoint. Maslow's theory of needs hierarchy (1970) maintains that there are several different kinds of needs which are arranged in a hierarchical manner. Although the lower deficiency (biological and psychological) needs may operate on the drive-reduction

principal as Hull-Spence suggested, the higher growth needs (meta needs) for knowledge, for meaning, for a feeling of importance are actually enhanced when a person is becoming more knowledgeable, receiving more meaning and feeling of importance. The best known need in Maslow's hierarchy is the need for self-actualization, the need to become what we are, to be everything we are capable of becoming. Although this actualization need as described by Maslow appears to be vague from a behavioristic point of view, it does sound similar to the effectance motivation described by White--the motivation to interact effectively with one's environment, to produce an impact on one's environment.

Locus of control. Recently, there have been growing research efforts to study a cognitive structure termed "locus of control." Locus of control (Rotter, 1966) deals with a person's subjectively perceived relationship between one's behavior and its consequences, and the person's attribution of the causes of reward and punishment in life to either one's own effort, or to outside uncontrollable factors. A perceived lack of control, or external locus of control, will lower a person's expectation of having effective interaction, and thus affects the person's action accordingly. When students believe that they can't learn because schooling is irrelevant, that teachers are unconcerned, and that their own effort is not a significant part of the learning process, the result is a group of unmotivated, bored to death, non-learning students. The so-called Coleman Report found a striking relationship between belief in personal control over academic achievement and the actual academic performance (1966). Based on a large sample of students, this report stated that: "A pupil attitude factor, which

appears to have a stronger relationship to achievement than do all the "school" factors together, is the extent to which an individual feels that he has some control over his own destiny" (p. 23). In general, studies have persistently found this relationship between locus of control and the person's academic achievement (Lefcourt, 1976; Phares, 1976). When subjects are led to believe that they had no control over the occurrence of rewards and punishments, ". . . They generalize less from the past and cannot use increasing experience on a task to develop better strategies or more accurate expectancies. . . . They learn a great deal less, and this decrement in learning seems directly attributable to the effects on expectancy of a belief that, in a given situation, they do not control the relationship between behavior and reinforcement" (Phares, 1976, p. 30). Individuals who perceived themselves as having lack of control to deal with threatening environments are also more prone to debilitating anxiety, depression and despair, a phenomena described by Seligman as "learned helplessness" (1975). Seligman contends that "learned helplessness" is the result of having experience with uncontrollable and unpredictable events. Whether those events are positive or negative, reward or punishment, the major consequences are motivational, cognitive and emotional. Uncontrollable events reduce the motivation to initiate responses to control other events; uncontrollability distorts the perception of control so that even if the person is or has been able to produce effective behavior to control the environment, the person may have difficulty learning and believing that he/she can or has succeeded. The emotional effects of uncontrollable events such as trauma have been well documented in clinical psychology, and Seligman compared

"learned helplessness" and depression and found many parallels. Hiroto (1974) found that the laboratory experience of uncontrollability, the cognitive set induced by chance instructions, and the external personality all produced learned helplessness. He speculates that a common state--the expectation that responses and consequences are independent --may underlie all three conditions to erode the motivation to escape.

In problem solving, internalists were found to be more active in interacting with people and events in the situation, more inquisitive to seek out information that would enable them to cope with the situation, more attentive to potentially relevant cues, more likely to remember and to utilize past experiences, and more persistent in trying and less likely to give up (DuCette & Wolk, 1973). Perhaps the internalists' belief that they are able to affect and control their environment is related to the feeling that they can control themselves. Non-smokers were found to be more internal than smokers (Straits & Sechrest, 1963). Whether young college coeds would practice some form of birth control was related to their locus of control (Lundy, 1972). Externalists tend to be more susceptible to social influences and conformed more readily when the source of influence is considered prestigious (Ritchie & Phares, 1969). The difference between internal and external orientation becomes especially significant on ambiguous social controversies where objective reality is lacking or hard to confirm. A study in the 1960's found that students who were consistent disbelievers of the Warren Commission Report were significantly more external and less trusting (Hamsher, Geller, & Rotter, 1968). On the more current controversy of the energy crisis, students who believed that energy resources were

controlled by powerful others whose manipulations created shortage, and personal conservation would not help the situation, were also more external (Bergsma & Bergsma, 1978). Externality has been described in the framework of powerlessness or alienation (Seeman, 1967). This "psychological powerlessness," although it may relate originally to the unresponsive environment, has an unfortunate consequence in that it tends to blind the person to perceive any opportunity to effectively control his environment, even when the opportunity is presented to him. A self-fulfilling prophecy is evident here, which leads to a firmly established vicious cycle.

Racial and socio-economic differences in locus of control. In 1963, Battle and Rotter reported that lower class Negroes were found to be significantly more external than middle class Negroes or whites, and that middle class children in general were more internal than lower class children. In a tri-ethnic sample, Graves (1961) found that in high school students, whites were most internal, followed by Spanish-Americans, and Indians were the most external.

Coleman, et al. (1966) concluded that, of ethnic groups in the United States, whites and Oriental-Americans were least external in their orientation, and Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, and Indians most external. The Coleman Report states:

> The special importance of a sense of control of environment for achievement of minority-group children and perhaps of disadvantaged whites as well suggests a different set of predispositional factors operating to create a low or high achievement for children from disadvantaged groups than for children from advantaged groups. For children from advantaged groups, achievement or lack of it appears closely related to their self-concept: what they believe about themselves. For children from disadvantaged groups, achievement, or lack of achievement appears to be

> closely related to what they believe about their environment: whether they believe the environment will respond to reasonable efforts, or whether they believe it is merely random or immovable. In different words, it appears that children from advantaged groups assume that the environment will respond if they are able to affect it; children from disadvantaged groups do not make this assumption, but in many cases assume that nothing they do can affect the environment--it will give benefits or withhold them but not as a consequence of their own action. (p. 23)

Justin (1969) studied male Mexican-American students and related socio-cultural factors to their achievement. In this study he found that the students' feelings of personal ability to control were related to access to some of the rewards of the Anglo culture and to delayed gratification. What was important, however, was that these students were more fatalistic (external) and less future oriented than their fellow Anglo classmates. This set of attitudes could be interpreted to demonstrate a locus of control which was fairly external among the Mexican-American students.

Stoddard's study (1969) revealed a positive relationship between a person's adoption of the new culture and externality. Penalosa and McDonagh (1966) showed what was most related to upward mobility in Mexican-Americans was that they did not relinquish ethnic traits, but shed lower class cultural traits. Second generation Mexican-Americans were found to be most upwardly mobile. The least upwardly mobile were recent immigrants who related involvement with the organizations of the adopted culture with suspicion because these organizations of the Anglo majority may manipulate them.

It may be realistic for recent migrant immigrants who face new and strange situations to assume an external locus of control as one way of coping with their perceived lack of control over the power structure.

Groups, either ethnic or class, who score higher in external locus of control are those whose social position and economic powers are minimal. Their subjective perception of lack of personal control may indeed be a realistic reflection of the social reality around these people. The unfortunate consequence is that, without intervention, this external orientation will prevent the perception of available opportunities even when such opportunities become possible, thus resulting in a vicious self-perpetuating cycle.

Locus of control revised. Since Rotter's concept of locus of control was first conceptualized, there has been voluminous research to study this concept and its relationship to human behavior. Many of the studies have pointed out the inadequacies of the original conceptualization and have contributed to its further modifications. For example, many studies found that internalists and externalists differ in their causal attribution under failure outcomes, not after successful outcomes. Some (Davis & Davis, 1972) suggested the possible existence of "defensive" externalism as an explanation. However, more recent evidences tend to support the position that internalists and externalists differ in perception of control for negative outcomes mainly, and locus of control orientation may fundamentally be more predictive of responses to negative events (Gregory, 1978). Weiner, et al. (1972) also argue that locus of control determines the affect associated with an outcome, rather than the expectancy of the outcome as Rotter specified. Furthermore, Weiner, et al. (1971) postulate that the stability of the attribute dimension, rather than locus of control, influences expectancy shifts. Locus of control as conceived by Rotter and his colleagues is a one-

dimensional classification scheme of perceptions of control varying from internal to external. Weiner (1972) demonstrates forcefully that besides the locus of control (internal vs. external) dimension, there exists another major dimension: stability of the cause. Although others like Rosenbaum (1972) propose intentionality as a third causal dimension, Weiner's 2 x 2 classification scheme has been the most influential in the area of motivation studies and will be reviewed below.

A cognitive psychology of motivation. Motivation is the term used to describe what energizes a person and what directs the person's activities. Motivation determines what interests people, defines their needs, guides their goals and values, affects their attitudes and aspirations, determines what are incentives for their behavior and sustains their prolonged efforts in the face of failure and frustration. It is no wonder that a teacher's motivation for teaching and a student's motivation for learning are important variables in determining the success of their teaching and learning behavior.

From a mechanistic and behavioristic perspective, Hull's conception of drive was a non-directive energizer of behavior, whose strength could be operationally defined by amount of deprivation, tissue injury, or electric shock. Cognitive psychology has greatly influenced the study of achievement motivation; starting from McClelland (1965), this area of research has always represented an integration of humanism and behaviorism. Atkinson (1964) postulates a motivation model in which achievement tendency is a multiplicative function of the strength of the achievement motive, the probability of success (task difficulty) and the incentive value of success. The major cognitive component in Atkinson's model is

the subjective probability of success as perceived by the individual. Although this cognitive component brings Atkinson's model closer to phenomenology, cognitions are treated as observables which influence action, rather than as epiphenomena. One recent development in the research on motivation as proposed by Weiner, et al. (1972) places emphasis on the cognitive component by inducing causal attribution as determinants of achievement behavior. The attribution model of achievement they propose is based on the assumptions that beliefs about causes of success and failure mediate between the perceptions of a given task and person's performance on the task. The causal dimensions are classified as locus of control (internal/external) and stability (ability/task difficulty). Locus of control affects the affective reactions to the success or failure outcome, and stability affects the perceived probability of success for future outcome. A series of studies (Bar-Tal, 1978) has demonstrated that individuals with different motivation needs differ in their attribution patterns. Individuals with high-motivation-needs tend to attribute their successes to their ability and effort, and their failure to lack of effort or external factors, and thus they experience pride (affect) after success, and readjust their effort after failure. Individuals low in achievement needs tend to attribute their success to external factors, their failure to lack of ability, and they tend to exclude personal effort as a significant component in their success or failure. Effort is internal and changeable, which opens the possibility of modifying the future outcomes, whereas ability is a more stable and unmodifiable disposition, which does not provide the possibility of changing future outcome. The belief in effort may be the major construct

behind the achievement motivation. The belief in effort makes a person assume that the outcomes depend on how hard one tries, how persistent one is, and how to select tasks that are intermediate in difficulty.

The information provided by this attributional model of achievement behavior motivation may facilitate our understanding of students' achievement behavior (Bar-Tal, 1978). For example, students who tend to perceive their lack of ability as the cause of their failure have the expectation for future continuing failure since ability is a stable disposition. In order to maximize achievement behavior, teachers should provide students with instructions and feedback to encourage internal attribution (ability and effort) for success and effort attribution for failure. To change students' maladaptive causal attribution to success and failure should improve their academic performance.

Each of the studies reviewed above reports highly limited segments of a very "complex interactive process" to use Potter's (1974) words; however, the ideas of expectancy, effectiveness, locus of control, motivation and effectance are all part of a cognitive fabric which will relate realistically to the development of means to make teachers and students more efficacious in their interactions with each other.

IV. IMPLICATIONS

Toward a Humanistic Behaviorism

The dichotomy between humanism and behaviorism was highlighted during the well-known Carl Rogers vs. B. F. Skinner debate (1962) which was a culmination of their 20 years of continuous dialogue. In the years that followed, controversial issues such as determinism vs. freedom to choose,

objectivity vs. subjectivity of personal experiences raised by Rogers and Skinner have not been sufficiently resolved so as to provide a guide for educators in their teaching and thinking. In 1977, another historical debate was sponsored by the Association for Supervision of Curriculum Development (ASCD) entitled, "Behaviorism and Humanism: A Synthesis?" As can be seen from the title, the general tendency of the debate was toward a synthesis between those two divided theoretical positions. "We are on the verge of a major breakthrough in American education based on taking the best from each of these two theories and breaking free of past conflicts," said Philip Hosford, the President of ASCD at the conference (Combs, Popham & Hosford, 1977, p. 52). As also can be seen from the question mark at the end of the title, there was an obvious doubt if the expected synthesis would actually emerge from the debate.

This ASCD 1977 debate was primarily concerned about the implications of humanism and behaviorism for education, rather than on their theoretical differences. Consequently, behaviorism was equated with the objective and systematic approach to education, and associated with the accountability of teaching and learning results as well as the systematic method to bring about these results. On the other hand, humanism was equated with a general and global goodwill toward the well-being of students. Undoubtedly, the behaviorism referred to in the debate was the radical behaviorism. Arthur Combs, as the proponent of humanism, believed that humanism and behaviorism could not be synthesized. Those theories were viewed as two fundamentally different tools, each was useful in its own way, yet could not and should not be synthesized. "What is needed is not synthesis, but synchronization" (p. 56). Combs believed that only humanism

can deal with broad, holistic goals of education, internal life and experiences of human beings, the precise void left by behaviorism in his opinion. Looking at the emergent studies in the areas of social behaviorism, many of which have been reviewed in the previous section, one can no longer say that behaviorism is not able to deal with human feelings, beliefs, hope and despair. Rogers' insistence in the 1962 debate that science must be broad enough to include subjective aspects of human experience has been met with the development of social behaviorism.

James Popham, as a spokesman for behaviorism at the ASCD conference, pointed out the danger of labeling, and the often inaccurate and emotionally laden connotations associated with the words "humanism" and "behaviorism." He believed that humanistic educators could adopt behavioristic approaches to teaching and evaluation. He also believed that whether to call these educators behavioral humanists or humanistic behaviorists would only be misleading, as "multi-meaning labels are not serviceable," and only the result of teaching should be counted.

Labeling is important as Popham pointed out, and does affect our impression formations relating to the concept, objects or events the label intends to represent. Social behaviorism has built upon the methods and findings of radical behaviorism, and yet, it has gone much further. There are tremendous implications this social behaviorism may have for education. However, educators may turn away from it because of the negative connotations behaviorism tends to generate, such as control and manipulation, such as the image of electric shock, prison abuse, mind control, "1984," and "Clockwork Orange," among others.

As early as 1974, Bandura predicted the development of a kind of humanistic behaviorism where behavior modification as well as other techniques found to be effective would be used toward humanistic goals (Kiester & Cudhea, 1974). To him, and many others, the dispute between humanism and behaviorism is artificial. However, behavior modification in particular, and behaviorism in general have been so imbued with negative feelings that it was difficult for the public to understand them objectively. Those who oppose them do not realize that their opposition is based on the same assumption radical behaviorism is built upon, i.e., behavior is controlled by its consequences. "When Skinner gets rid of autonomous inner man, he creates an autonomous environment that controls man," Bandura pointed out (p. 29). The common fear of behaviorism is also, ironically, based on this belief that men are hopelessly controlled by their environment, and that by manipulating the consequences and by controlling the environment, human behavior can be changed deviously and passively against individuals' will. Social behaviorism has been able to show that quite often change does not occur unless the person understands what is being reinforced, and behavior that has been reinforced does not increase if the individual believes that the same action will not be reinforced in the future (Estes, 1972). By stressing the cognitive process as the center of acquisition and retention of human behavior, and the importance of subjective perception of the relationship between one's behavior and its consequences, social behaviorism has given back human beings their "mind." By insisting that although human beings are controlled by environmental contingencies, the contingencies are also often of their own making, social behaviorism has given

back human beings their share of the "responsibility" in their own destiny.

Although social behaviorism may at this point sound similar to humanism, there are however, several fundamental differences. This central cognitive process differs from the "inner self" in humanism in that even though the person's expectancy may be subjective, it is learned, and can be unlearned, studied, analyzed, and understood. Furthermore, with an insistence on soundly designed methodology, social behaviorism builds upon empirical evidences and therefore, it is constantly self-improving and renewing. For example, Rotter's locus of control provides the conceptual base for much research which over the years has demonstrated the inadequacies in Rotter's original formulation. However, in the process, we are beginning to have a fuller picture of the effects of expectancies in human behavior which would not be possible without Rotter's conceptualization. General and global statements about human nature, if they do not lend to empirical hypothesis testing, stay as general and global opinions at most, and are only philosophical exercises.

All educators are concerned about students' well-being, and like to consider themselves humanists. Perhaps to be a humanist takes far more than just to have positive regard and goodwill toward the well-being of others. Perhaps the most humanistic way a teacher can adopt is to know why certain change will help the students and how this change can be accomplished. As demonstrated by Carol Dweck (1975), the best way to alleviate children's feelings of helplessness is not to provide only successful experiences.

A better and more humane way is to teach these helpless children to

take personal responsibility for failure experience and to attribute the failure to their own lack of effort, as the success-only group continued to go to pieces after failure and the personal-responsibility group showed markedly contrasting behavior to failure and much reduced test anxiety. As also demonstrated, although unsolvable problems, and unescapable traumas cause learned helplessness, uncontrollable rewards also impair responding for future rewards (Seligman, 1975). In other words, it is not the lack of rewards, rather it is the non-contingency of rewards to one's action that eventually leads to the deterioration of subjective belief of personal control. When rewards and/or punishments in one's life happen independently of one's behavior, one eventually believes that one's action is futile and stops trying to obtain reward and/or to avoid punishment. Indeed, Seligman says it well that,

> ...helplessness caused by failure in the classroom can be reversed, even in apparently intractable cases. The crucial manipulation was training the school children to cope with failure by attributing it to their own lack of effort. Such an attribution replaces the belief of a helpless child that he fails because there is nothing he can do. On the other hand, exposure to repeated success in which failure is avoided or glossed over leaves the child helpless, or makes him more so. To reverse classroom helplessness, it is necessary to experience some failure and to develop a way to cope with it . . . If a young adult has no experience of coping with anxiety and frustration, if he never fails and then overcomes, he will not be able to cope with failure, boredom, or frustration when it becomes crucial. Too much success, too coddled an existence, makes a child helpless when he is finally confronted with his first failure. . . . I believe that many of my 'failures,' through too much success, have developed insufficient coping mechanisms. Their parents and teachers, out of a misguided sense of kindness, made things much too easy for them. . . . Unless a young person confronts anxiety, boredom, pain, and trouble, and masters them by his actions, he will develop an impoverished sense of his own competence." (p. 157-158)

There may indeed be an innate human motive to produce an effect in one's environment, a drive for competence, to resist compulsion, or to

avoid helplessness (Seligman, 1975). A humanistic behaviorism based on this assumption echoes the humanism's contention of self-actualization as an innate human potential, although it develops from the empirical data based on behavioristic tradition. In essence, this humanistic behaviorism states that:

1. Human beings are active thinkers, and how they think about themselves, the world, and their ability to interact with their world significantly affect their actual interaction with the world.

2. Human beings actively organize their experiences, formulate questions and find answers in order to understand events in the world. Their subjective perception is affected by, but does not always correspond to the objective occurrence of events.

3. Human beings are influenced by their environment, but they also influence their environment. In the triadic deterministic interaction, a person's personality structure (including cognition), behavior (including skills), and the person's environment interact continuously and dynamically. Changes may occur through rearrangement of environment, improving personal skills, but the enhanced expectancy of self-efficacy in the person's cognitive structure is the center for behavioral changes.

4. The motivation for effectance, to produce an effect on one's environment, may be an inborn tendency in human beings. This motive, as well as human cognition, perception and emotion, can be studied, analyzed and understood in terms of how they occur; their antecedent conditions and consequent events.

5. Empirical evidences should be the primary sources to derive means and ways in order to enhance the person's self-efficacy.

Self-Efficacy in Multicultural Education

In this society, we have embarked upon one of the greatest experiments in human history to create avenues for peoples of all kinds to participate equally. The historical record, however, reveals that inequity prevails, particularly in schools. The major culture, through textbooks, mass media, insensitive teachers, and social influences, has perpetuated the inequity in schools historically, and has fostered an environment of negative expectancies for people of different cultures. It is, therefore, the responsibility of peoples of all cultures and races to address this issue of inequity in order to create positive environmental changes.

As stated in the Introduction section, the present paper approaches the issue of educational equity from the perspective of individuals' perceptions of the opportunity available to them and their ability to interact with their world effectively. The proposed model of humanistic behaviorism, with its emphasis on self-efficacy, has special implications for multicultural education. The changing social, environmental conditions with intention to provide more opportunity for those who are traditionally disadvantaged may not result in corresponding equal participation, if the subjective expectancy concerning the personal accessibility to this opportunity is not fostered at the same time. Efficacious interaction with one's environment is the essence of equal participation in the society. Such efficacious interaction is based on the subjective belief that one's participation is contingent upon one's personal action and that one has the skills required to produce the outcomes of equal participation. Although we are affected by our environment, we are also

the most important element in our own environment and can change the shape of our own environment.

The teacher's role in multicultural settings is certainly a key factor toward the development of students' attitudes about themselves in schools. A given teacher's attitude may create classroom structures which predetermine the student's success or failure expectancies. Teachers communicate much more than their lessons; cultural biases may create "self-fulfilling prophecies" among culturally different students. There is a great need for teachers to be involved personally in cross-cultural settings to develop cultural sensitivity. In other words, it is necessary for those who teach in a multicultural setting to actively and responsibly develop and acquire efficacious interaction within that culture. What greater sense of personal efficacy is there than, to use Paulo Freire's (1968) words, "acquiring the language" of that culture? Language acquisition used broadly, including non-verbal communication, subtle affective interactions, and the skills in creating desirable changes in students, lend to the efficacious interaction between teachers and students in that culture. Just as the acquisition of "the language of the oppressors," mentioned by Freire, which includes the skills of reading and writing, the tools of modern technology, is the necessary condition for those who are traditionally disadvantaged to equally participate and interact with the major culture efficaciously.

Indeed, "goodwill towards men" alone may not be sufficient to bring about humane and efficacious interactions. Goodwill must be accompanied by responsible, thoughtful strategies, by allowing the person the chance to make the quest for personal control. We all feel sorry for Johnny

who cannot read. If Johnny is convinced that he cannot read because of the school environment and because of insensitive teachers, Johnny may never read. To deprive Johnny of his share of responsibility in his own learning is to deprive Johnny of his sense of personal competence, which renders Johnny helpless in his personal quest for learning. Out of goodwill, this may actually be the most inhumane act of all. The cultural sensitivity that teachers should possess in multicultural education does not carry with it a misguided kindness which makes only external excuses for students' failures, and shields students from confronting their own mistakes. Praising students indiscriminately, always giving passing grades and assigning work that is so easy students cannot possibly fail, have often the same effects on students' learning as punishing students indiscriminately, always failing students, and assigning work that students can never accomplish. When the rewards and punishments in schools bear no relationship to students' action, students become helpless, unmotivated and external, as they no longer believe that the success and failure in schools are under their personal control. If we accept the assumption of the humanistic behaviorism proposed in this paper that there may indeed be an innate human motive to produce an effect in one's environment, to resist compulsion, or to avoid helplessness, then to deprive anyone of his/her belief of personal control would be to deprive that person of his/her humanity. When merits are awarded independently of one's action and based solely on race or sex, then the meaning of one's action, one's sense of self-efficacy is also being deprived. A truly humanistic-behavioristic teacher in multicultural education would have a sense of personal efficacy in one's ability to affect students

positively, regardless of students' colors and races. She/he would seek out positive behavior and attitudes of students, and reward them discriminately and contingently. She/he would help students to develop positive attitudes and strategies to deal with failure, frustrations and boredom, knowing that these events are inevitable in life and that the abilities to overcome them are fundamental to students' sense of personal competence. A humanistic-behavioristic teacher does not believe one is a helpless victim of one's environment; she/he works on the environment actively to produce changes in the students, so that the students will take personal responsibility for the conquest of their existence.

Paulo Freire (1965) has stated in Pedagogy of the Oppressed:

> The oppressed, having internalized the image of the oppressor and adopted his guidelines, are fearful of freedom. Freedom would require them to eject this image and replace it with autonomy and responsibility. Freedom is acquired by conquest, not by gift. It must be pursued constantly and responsibly. Freedom is not an ideal located outside of man; nor is it an idea which becomes myth. It is rather the indispensable condition for the quest for human completion. (p. 31)

Freire has, unbeknown to him, captured the essence of self-efficacy in multicultural education in this paragraph. There exists a reciprocal interactive relationship between teachers' sense of self-efficacy in teaching and motivating the students, students' sense of self-efficacy in their ability to learn, and the general multicultural environmental variables. The development of self-efficacy is contingent upon one's taking personal responsibility for one's teaching or learning. Autonomy has its responsibilities, freedom has to result from conquest, and effective coping skills (or acquiring the language of the oppressors according to Freire) are necessary to have successful transactions with one's environment, a quest for human completion.

REFERENCES

Armor, D., et al. Analysis of the school preferred reading programs in selected Los Angeles minority schools. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, 1976.

Aspy, D. & Roebuck, F. Kids don't learn from people they don't like. Amherst, Massachusetts: Human Resources Development Press, 1977.

Atkinson, J. W. An introduction to motivation. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1964.

Bandura, A. Principles of behavior modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Bandura, A. Social learning theory. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press, 1971.

Bandura, A. Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 1977, 84, 191-215.

Bandura, A. The self system in reciprocal determinism. American Psychologist, 1978, 33(4), 344-358.

Bandura, A., Blachard, E. B., & Ritter, B. Relative efficacy of desensitization and modeling approaches for inducing behavioral, affective, and attitudinal changes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 13, 173-199.

Banks, J. A., & Grambs, J. D. Black self-concept. Hightstown, New Jersey: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Bar-Tal, D. Attributional analysis of achievement-related behavior. Review of Educational Research, 1978, 48(2), 259-271.

Baratz, S. & Baratz, J. Early childhood intervention: The social science base of institutional racism. Harvard Educational Review, 1970, 40, 1.

Battle, E. & Rotter, J. Children's feelings of personal control as related to social class and ethnic group. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 482-490.

Bergsma, H. M. Teacher expectancies toward the culturally different. The International Foundations of Education Quarterly, 1974, 1(1), 97-104.

Bergsma, L. C., & Bergsma, H. M. Internal-external control and attitudes toward energy conservation and Warren Commission Report. Journal of Psychology, 1978, 99, 255-257.

Berman, P., et al. Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VII. Factors Affecting Implementation and Continuation. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, 1978.

Bowers, K. S. Situationism in psychology: An analysis and a critique. Psychological Review, 1973, 80, 307-336.

Burkhard, M. I. Discernment of teacher characteristics by T.A.T. sequence analysis. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1962, 53, 279-287.

Cole, M., Gay, J., Glick, J. A., and Sharp, W. W., et al. The cultural content of learning and thinking, an exploration in experimental anthropology. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1971.

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. L. Equality of educational opportunity. Superintendent of Documents Catalog No. FS 5.238: 38001, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Coles, R. Teachers and children of poverty. Washington, D.C.: The Potomac Institute, Inc., 1970.

Combs, A. W., Popham, W. J., & Hosford, P. L. Behaviorism and humanism: A systhesis? Educational Leadership, Oct. 1977, 52-63.

Corkhuff, R. R., & Banks, G. Learning as a preferred mode of facilitating relations between races and generations. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 413.

Davis, W., & Davis, D. Internal-external control and attribution of responsibility for success and failure. Journal of Personality, 1972, 40, 123-136.

Deutsch, M. The role of social class in language development. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1965, 35, 78.

DuCette, J., & Wolk, S. Cognitive and motivational correlates of generalized expectancies for control. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 26, 420-426.

Dweck, C. S. The role of expectations and attributions in the abbreviation of learned helplessness. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31(4), 674-685.

Endler, N. S., & Magnusson, D. (Eds.). Interactional psychology and personality. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere, 1975.

Estes, W. K. Reinforcement in human behavior. American Scientist, 1972, 60, 723-729.

Freire, P. Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: The Seabury Press, 1968.

Goldin, P. C. A model for racial awareness training of teachers in integrated schools. Integrated Education: Race and Schools, 1970, 8.

Graves, T. Time perspective and the deferred gratification pattern in a tri-ethnic community. Research Report No. 5, Tri-Ethnic Research Project, University of Colorado, Institute of Behavioral Science, 1961.

Gregory, W. L. Locus of control for positive and negative outcomes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1978, 36(8), 840-849.

Hamsher, J. H., Geller, J. D., & Rotter, J. B. Interpersonal trust, internal-external control, and the Warren Commission Report. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 210-215.

Hentoff, N. Our children are dying. New York: Viking Paperbacks, 1967.

Hiroto, D. S. Locus of control and learned helplessness. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 1974, 102, 187-193.

Hosford, P. L. The silent curriculum: Its impact on the teaching of basics. Educational Leadership, Dec. 1978, 211-215.

Jones, E., Kanouse, D., Kelley, H., Nisbett, R., Valins, S., & Weiner, B. Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior. New Jersey: General Learning Press, 1971.

Justin, N. The relationship of certain socio-cultural factors to the academic achievement of male Mexican-American high school seniors (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, 1969).

Kiester, E., & Cudhea, D. Albert Bandura: A very modern model. Human Behavior, Sep. 1974, 27-31.

Lefcourt, H. M. Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research. New York: John Willey & Sons, 1976.

Lehman, I. J. & Mehrens, W. A. Five attempts to replicate the experimenter bias effect. In T. X. Barber (Ed.), Educational Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971.

Lockhead-Katz, M. Measure of teacher expectations. P.B.T.E., Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education, Syracuse University, 1974, 2.

Lundy, J. R. Some personality correlates of contraceptive use among unmarried female college students. Journal of Psychology, 1972, 80, 9-14.

Maslow, A. H. Motivation and personality (2nd Ed.). New York: Van Nostrand, 1970.

McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A., & Lowell, E. L. The achievement motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.

Penalosa, F., & McDouagh, E Social mobility in a Mexican-American community. Social Forces, 1966, 44, 435-441.

Phares, E. J. Locus of control in personality. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press, 1976.

Potter, D. Teacher behavior and student achievement. P.B.T.E., Multi-State Consortium on Performance-Based Teacher Education, Syracuse University, 1974, 2.

Rist, R. C. Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. Harvard Educational Review, 1970, 40, 448.

Ritchie, E., & Phares, E. J. Attitude change as a function of internal-external control and communicator status. Journal of Personality, 1969, 37, 429-443.

Rohwer, W. D. Learning, race and school success. Review of Educational Research, 1971, 41, 191.

Rosenbaum, R. M. A dimensional analysis of the perceived causes of success and failure (Doctoral dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1972).

Rosenshine, B. Teaching behaviors related to pupil achievement: A review of research. In I. Westbury and A. Bellack (Eds.). Research Into Classroom Process. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971.

Rosenthal, R., & Jacobsen, L. Pygmalion in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Ross, L., Rodin, J., & Zimbardo, P. G. Toward an attribution therapy: The reduction of fear through induced cognitive-emotional misattribution. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 12, 279-288.

Rotter, J. B. Social learning and clinical psychology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1954.

Rotter, J. B. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs, 1966, 80.

Rotter, J. B., Change, J. E., & Phares, E. J. Applications of a social learning theory of personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972.

Ryans, D. G. Characteristics of teachers, their description, comparisons and appraisal: A research study. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Schachter, S. Emotion, obesity and crime. New York: Academic Press, 1971.

Schachter, S., & Singer, J. E. Cognitive, social and physiological determinants of emotional state. Psychological Review, 1962, 69, 379-399.

Seeman, M. Powerlessness and knowledge: A comparative study of alienation and learning. Sociometry, 1967, 30, 105-123.

Seligman, M. E. Helplessness: On depression, development and death. San Francisco: Freeman and Company, 1975.

Smith, M. B. The phenomenological approach in personality theory: Some critical remarks. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1950, 45, 516-522.

Stoddard, E. The U.S.-Mexican border as a research laboratory. Journal of Inter-American Studies, 1969, 11, 447-488.

Straits, B. C., & Sechrest, L. Further support of some findings about characteristics of smokers and non-smokers. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1963, 27, 282.

Weiner, B. Achievement motivation and attribution theory. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Corporation, 1974.

Weiner, B., Frieze, I., Kukla, A., Reed, L., & Rosenbaum, R. M. Perceiving the causes of success and failure. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press, 1971.

Weiner, B., Heckhausen, H., Meyer, W., & Cook, R. E. Causal ascriptions and achievement behavior: A conceptual analysis of effort and reanalysis of locus of control. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1972, 21, 239-248.

White, R. W. Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. Psychological Review, 1959, 66, 297-333.

White, R. W. Competence and the psychological stages of development. In M. Jones (Ed.). Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1960.

White, R. W. Ego and reality in psychoanalytic theory, a proposal for independent ego energies. Psychological Issues, 1963, 3(3).